Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—I want to know whether the Chief Minister is aware that South Indians as a whole are averse to making Hindi as the national language ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I do not think it can be asked under this Question, Sir. It is not relevant. But let me assure the House that there is no such opposition and South Indians are not averse to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question time is over.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up).

Bus Service between Gulbarga-Sedam and Gulbarga-Shahabad.

Q.—2658. Sri S. R. PATIL (Kalgi).—Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Gulbarga-Sedam Shahabad Road is not fit for the running of buses ;

(*b*) whether they are aware of the hardships caused to the public on account of Government buses not being run on the said route ;

(*c*) whether they are also aware of the fact that only one private bus and many private lorries are running on that route ;

(*d*) when they propose to run Government bus service on the said road ?

A.—Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs and Industries).—

(*a*) Gulbarga—Sedam and Gulbarga—Shahabad Roads are fit for running of buses.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Two private buses of Sri Gurunath Reddy are plying under temporary permits on Gulbarga-Sedam route, private lorries are also running on this route.

(*d*) When the requisite permits are granted by the Regional Transport Authority.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES.

Presentation.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Chairman, Committee of Privileges).—I beg to present the report of the Committee of Privileges on the question raised by Sri K. Puttaswamy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The report is presented.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapoor).—On a point of order. The Rules provide for the amendments of the Report, Sir. In fact, this is on the Agenda and the Report was presented only just now. We want to go through the Report and we want sufficient time to table amendments to the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can postpone it.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1958.

Introduction.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, with your permission, I would like to sit and introduce the Bill. I introduce :

> "The Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1958 which has been published in the *Mysore Gazette* under rules 46 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1958, is introduced.

*Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapoor).—Sir, I rise to a point of order. This is a Bill just like any other Bill. The proviso under rule 51 says :

> "Provided that no such motion shall be made until after copies of the Bill have been made available for the use of members, and that any member may object to any such motion being made unless copies of the Bill have been so made available for three days, before the day on which the motion is made, and such objection shall prevail, unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made."

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

We do not know whether there is any special consideration for introducing the Bill without making the copies available to the members. Just now copies are made available. Sir, it is a mandatory provision of law that this Bill is just like any other Bill. Even the Constitution under article 204 provides that only under certain circumstances, amendment might not be given. But, there is the possibility of giving amendment to this Bill. Article 204 reads thus:

"As soon as may be after the grants under article 203 have been made by the Assembly, there shall be introduced a Bill to provide for the appropriation out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of all moneys required to meet—

(*a*) the grants so made by the Assembly; and

(*b*) the expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State but not exceeding in any case the amount shown in the statement previously laid before the House or Houses.

(2) No amendment shall be proposed to any such Bill in the House or either House of the Legislature of the State which will have the effect of varying the amount or altering the destination of any grant so made or of varying the amount of any expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State, and the decision of the person presiding as to whether an amendment is inadmissible under this clause shall be final".

So, an amendment is contemplated. Whether such an amendment is within the law or outside the law is for the Speaker to decide. But, an amendment is contemplated under article 204 of the Constitution and we have got every right to give a consideration to the whole Bill and see whether an amendment is to be given. Now, we had no opportunity to consider the Bill and so I oppose the introduction of this Bill.

*SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—Sir, and Appropriation Bill is merely the consolidation of all theDemands that have already been discussed and adopted by this House. Therefore, time is not necessary. It is a convention that Appropriation Bill is brought on a certain day. Of course, copies should be provided and they have been provided. If my friend wants some time to study and speak on the Bill, the Bill may be taken up in the afternoon. But amendment need not be sent because this is nothing but the sum up of the whole discussion that has taken place all these days.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Sir, I draw your kind attention to rules 130 and 131. It could be seen from rule 131 that after the introduction, the Speaker will have to allot a day or days and give us all opportunities to give amendments.

SRI V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—Sir, I rise to support the objection raised by my friend Sir Srinivas Shetty. But, I rely upon rule 53. Rule 53 (1) is: "when a Bill is introduced.....

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Patil, 51 and 53 are the same.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—In the proviso, there is a clear wording and no such motion shall be made until after copies of the Bill have been made available for the use of the members, and that any member may object to any such motion being made unless copies of the Bill have been so made available before three days. The Bill clearly shows that it is printed on 26th April and to-day cannot be the third day. So, it cannot be introduced unless the rule is suspended. There is nothing on record of this House to show that the regular procedure has been suspended by the Speaker so far as this Bill is concerned. So long as that ruling is not there, that power is not exercised, I feel that the objection raised by my friend should be upheld.

Secondly, we have got the right to discuss the Bill as any other Bill not only in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Constitution but also the procedure we *follow* in this House and the British Parliament which has

been reiterated as could be seen on pages 308, 311 and 746 of May's Parliamentary Procedure. According to the British Parliament also this Bill has to be debated and 3 or 4 days are allotted for such Bills. I submit that this Bill has been brought forward today only; in fact, it is handed over to us when we entered the House. Under these circumstances, it will be highly unjust to take up the consideration of this Bill at present.

MR. SPEAKER.—This is not a new point altogether. On this point, I have already given a ruling. I will first deal with the question raised by my Hon'ble friend Sri V. Srinivas Shetty in respect of clause 2 of rule 130. He means to say that every time after introduction on the floor of the House of the Appropriation Bill, the Speaker may allot a day or days. According to him, with which I agree, the right will vest in the Chair only after the Bill is introduced. So the Bill has been introduced now. Now I allot this day for the discussion of the Appropriation Bill.

There is a precedent. Regarding the contention by the Hon'ble Members that this Bill is as any other ordinary Bill, so far as the Constitution is concerned, that is so. But there is also something which I must bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Members. They are under the impression that they can table amendments. Theoretically it is so. But nowhere the amendments are proposed to the Appropriation Bill. Firstly on account of the conventions, no amendments should be proposed to the Appropriation Bill and secondly on account of clause 2 of article 204. It is very clear. It leaves no scope for any amendment, though formally and theoretically an amendment may be made. But the right to table amendments is much hedged by conditions and it is impossible for any Hon'ble Member to give amendments. I will read clause 2 of article 204:

> "No amendment shall be proposed to any such Bill in the House or either House of the Legislature of the State which will have the effect of varying the amount or altering the destination of any grant so made or of varying the amount of any expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State, and the decision of the person presiding as to whether an amendment is inadmissible under this clause shall be final."

After all the Appropriation Bill is only a replica of what has taken place and what has been passed by this House so far as the grants are concerned. So there is very little scope for amendments. Amendments are not tabled anywhere not only on account of the constitutional provisions, but also because, it is in consonance with the conventions of the House.

Last time, I made some observations on the Appropriation Bill. I would like to read the whole passage so that it may be clear to all the members.

> "Before I call upon members to speak, I would like to make a few observations regarding the scope of discussion before us. I have prepared a Note and I propose to read it."

The Note was to this effect:

> "As Hon'ble Members are aware, the procedure set out in the Constitution for the disposal of financial business more or less follows the procedure in vogue in the House of Commons. In the House of Commons, a Vote on Account is a normal annual feature of financial procedure. This is intended to provide the House with sufficient time and opportunity to discuss the estimates, and where a Vote on Account is resorted to, it becomes possible to debate the Estimates even after the beginning of the financial year. As such, and since the normal procedure of a General Debate on the Budget and Voting of Demands for Grants becomes available to Members in respect of each financial year, the Demand for a grant of Vote on Account is voted without any debate whatsoever and similarly, the Appropriation Bill relating thereto is passed without any debate. However, during this

(MR. SPEAKER)

Session, I have been guided mainly by the consideration that many of the Hon'ble Members in the House will be retiring. There is also the fact that no time had been allotted for a general debate on the Budget since that will come in the new Assembly. It was on a consideration of these circumstances that I permitted an elaborate debate at the stage of voting on Demands for Grants. I may mention that as many as 27 Hon'ble Members took part in the debate and various matters were traversed. I therefore feel that no further debate is necessary on the Appropriation Bill.

Even in the Course of Appropriation Bills relating to regular Demands for Grants."

This is important.

"...I may mention that both in the House of Commons as well as in the Lok Sabha, debate is restricted to matters not dealt with at the time of voting the Estimates. Otherwise, there will be considerable repetition of identical arguments and no useful purpose will be served by permitting such debate.

I would only say that I do not want Hon'ble Members to repeat the same arguments. If there are any new points to be made out or new arguments, I would certainly allow such new points and new arguments to be raised in the House."

So I will submit one thing to the Hon'ble Members and that is that I am entitled to say that this Bill may be taken up for consideration today, even under rule 130. The second thing is that though theoretically it is possible to table amendments, in fact it is not possible to table any amendment at all on account of the fact that the constitutional provision is very much restricted and also on account of the fact that there are conventions in this respect. Thirdly, so far as the point that was raised by two Hon'ble Members that three days have not elapsed is concerned, I would say I have taken recourse under proviso to rule 51 "unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made". I have taken this recourse because this is a very formal sort of Bill and it does not require any such elaboration or elaborate arguments. That is why I request the Hon'ble Members in this respect to bear with me that as the scope of the Bill is very much limited, no new arguments will be allowed and if at all any Hon'ble Member wants to table an amendment, he would be free to do so. But that is not the convention. Even if he does so, I would say that none of the amendments would be allowed, because the restrictions are so many. That is why it is not possible for any amendment to survive.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Your Honour has referred to article 204 (2). Here the amendments are prohibited only regarding any grant made but not expenditure charged on the Consolidated fund. So far as grants for voting are concerned, there is no prohibition. Of course the difficulty in giving these amendments and then admission by you and then circulation to the Members—all these difficulties are there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is only reading the last portion.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I will read the whole thing:

"No amendment shall be proposed to any such Bill in the House or either House of the Legislature of the State which will have the effect of varying the amount or altering the destination of any grant so made or of varying the amount of any expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State . . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—"so made or ..",-it also covers the grants which are voted and the amounts which are charged.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—And another thing, Sir. I am referring to rule 53 proviso and not 51. Under 51 your Honour has got the power to give the permission. But under 53, I think there is no power given to the Speaker to condone this delay.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no reference at all in 53.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Proviso to rule 53, Sir. . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Your 53 is 51 in my copy.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am not referring to 51. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—" Provided no such motion shall be made. . . . .

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am reading Sir : " Provided that no such motion shall be made until. . . . ."

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why I say. Under that I have power. " . . . unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made." I have allowed the motion to be made.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I beg to move :

" That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

" That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill be taken into consideration."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud)—I am grateful to the Hon'ble Speaker for clarifying the point that the Appropriation bill Boes not admit of any elaborate argument or repetition of arguments on the same points arising out of certain demands for grants. But the point I wish to make on this occassion is one which has not been raised on the floor of this House and arises out of a situation created by the Government itself in respect of education.

It was announced yesterday in the newspapers that the Government had set-up a Committee to help the Mysore University Re-organisation work. I wish mention had been made of this at the time I raised a point on the floor of this House as to what exactly was going to be the future set-up of the Intermediate Colleges in the districts and whether they were going to upgrade them. Replying on behalf of Government, the Hon'ble Minister for Education never touched the point and we are surprised to see that Government have taken a decision to set up a Committee headed by Dr. A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar. The terms of reference have also been published. I must admit to a feeling of very great surprise that Government should have taken a decision like this. I want to know under what powers Government have constituted a committee like this. They have conceded autonomy to the University of Mysore and in a matter which affects the working of the University, the several courses of study and the policy of admission and the policy of Government and various other matters which are mentioned in the terms of reference to this Committee, I should like to know the powers vested with the Government in regard to the appointment of such a committee. I would invite the attention of the Hon'ble Speaker and the members of this House to the University Act of 1956, Section 49. I shall read it for the benefit of the House :

" Visitorial Powers and Control : (1) The Government shall have the right to cause an inspection to be made by such person or persons as it may direct, of the University, its buildings, laboratories, libraries, museums . . . .

49 (2) "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) if at any time, the Government is of opinion that in any matter the affairs of the University are not managed in the furtherance of the object and purposes of the University or in accordance with this Act and the Statutes and Ordinances or that special measures are desirable to maintain the standard of University teaching or examination it may indicate to the Syndicate any matter in regard to which it desires an explanation and call upon that body to offer such explanation within such time as may be specified by the Government. If the Syndicate fails to offer any explanation within the time specified or offers an explanation which in the opinion of the Government is unsatisfactory, the Government may issue instruc-